



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,498	10/30/2003	Sanjay Aiyagari	50325-0805	9591
29989 7590 01/31/2007 HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			EXAMINER KIM, PAUL	
			ART UNIT 2161	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/698,498	Applicant(s) AIYAGARI ET AL.	
	Examiner Paul Kim	Art Unit 2161	

All Participants:

(1) Paul Kim.

(2) Daniel Ladesma.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Christopher J. Palermo.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 January 2007

Time: 2:00 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Independent claim 1.

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Issue 1: Attorneys for Applicants and Examiner Kim discussed the intentions of having the term "Operating System" capitalized through the claims. Attorneys kindly explained that said capitalization was used so that the would be consistently used in the Specification, Drawings, and claims.

Issue 2: Attorneys for Applicants and Examiner Kim discussed the operability of claim 1. Specifically, Examiner brought into question how the successful performance of a file operation necessitated the granting of user access to a resource. Examiner Kim asserted that claims 6 and 7 seemed to provide the necessary bridge between the successful file operation and the granting of privileges to perform the resource operation (i.e. granting the user access to the resource). Attorneys argued that the incorporation of a claim limitation which bridged the gap between "calling the Operating System" and "granting the user access" was unnecessary. No agreement was reached regarding the aforementioned issue. Furthermore, Attorneys explained that the disclosed invention comprised of an RBAC system which made an API call to the OS. Thereafter, the OS would perform the file operations as requested by the API call, and a response that the file operation had properly performed would then allow access to the resource.